

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-36, and 39-70 remain pending in the instant application. Claims 1, 4-36, and 39-70 presently stand rejected. Claims 1 and 36 are amended herein. Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102*

Claims 1, 5-13, 16, 36, 40-48, and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yeo et al. (US 6,738,509).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element of the claim is found in a single reference. M.P.E.P § 2131 (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.” M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

Amended claim 1 recites:

A method for processing images, the method comprising:  
act A: converting a *single first image data* from a first color space into a second image data that corresponds to a second color space, wherein the single first image data includes a first pixel and a second pixel, wherein *the first pixel corresponds only to a first color component and the second pixel corresponds only to a second color component* that is different from the first color component;  
act B: perform image processing on the second image data in the second color space to form a processed image data; and  
act C: converting the processed image data to a third image data that corresponds to any one color space from a set of color spaces, the set of color spaces comprising:  
the first color space;  
a third color space; and  
the second color space but using a conversion method that is different from a conversion method that is used to perform act A.

Thus, independent claim 1 includes converting a **single** first image data that includes a first pixel corresponding **only to a first color component** and a second pixel corresponding **only to a second color component** that is different from the first color component. Applicant respectfully submits that Yeo fails to disclose this expressly recited element, as is more fully explained below.

First, Yeo fails to disclose converting a **single** first image data as presently claimed. Instead, Yeo discloses a method of compressing a **multi-spectral** image. As noted in the December 13, 2008 Office Action, Yeo defines a multi-spectral image at column 1, line 20, which states “[a] multi-spectral image is a collection of **two or more** monochrome images of the same scene.” [Emphasis added.] Thus, Yeo discloses utilizing **two or more** separate source images for its conversion process, not a *single first image data* as presently claimed.

Second, assuming for arguments sake that the Examiner considers each of the monochrome images of the multi-spectral image of Yeo to disclose a single first image data, then the reference still fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1. For example, Amended claim 1 recites that the single first image data includes a first pixel corresponding **only to a first color component** and a second pixel corresponding **only to a second color component** that is different from the first color component. As discussed above, Yeo discloses that each of the individual images that make-up the multi-spectral image are **monochrome**. That is, the monochrome images only contain a single type of color component.

Consequently, Yeo fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1, as required under M.P.E.P. § 2131. Accordingly, Applicants request that the instant §102 rejections of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim 36 recites:

A computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions for computing degrees of parallelism for parallel operations in a computer system, wherein execution of the one or more sequences of instructions by one or more processors causes the one or more processors to perform the acts of:

- act A: converting a first image data from a first color space into a second image data that corresponds to a second color space;
- act B: perform image processing on the second image data in the second color space to form a processed image data; and
- act C: *converting the processed image data to a third image data that corresponds to the second color space but using a conversion method that is different from a conversion method that is used to perform act A.*

Thus, amended claim 36 includes converting the processed image data to a third image data of the second color space, but using a conversion method that is different than the conversion method that is used in the initial conversion of the first image data.

Applicants respectfully submit that Yeo fails to disclose at least this expressly recited element. For example, Yeo explicitly states “multi-spectral images [are] transformed from a first color space to a second color space and ultimately back to the first color space.” See Yeo, Abstract. Thus, Yeo discloses transforming multi-spectral images from a first to a second and then back to the first color spaces. Nowhere in Yeo, does this reference disclose converting a processed image data to a third image data that corresponds to a second color space, much less using a conversion method that is different than an initial conversion method, as presently recited in claim 36.

Consequently, Yeo fails to disclose each and every element of claim 36, as required under M.P.E.P. § 2131. Accordingly, Applicants request that the instant §102 rejections of claim 36 be withdrawn.

#### *Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103*

The dependent claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeo et al. in view of various combinations of Acharya et al. (US 6,236,433), Rashkovskiy et al. (US 6,252,577) and Acharya (US Patent Application Publication US 2002/0101524 A1).

None of these additionally cited references cure the deficiencies of Yeo. Thus, the dependent claims are novel and nonobvious over the cited references for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with their respective independent claims,

in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the instant § 102 and § 103 rejections of the dependent claims also be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe the applicable rejections have been overcome and all claims remaining in the application are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at (206) 292-8600 if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

### CHARGE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

It is not believed that extensions of time are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). Any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Please credit any overpayment to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: March 13, 2008

/Andrew J. Cameron Reg. #50281/

Andrew J. Cameron  
Reg. No. 50,281  
Phone: (206) 292-8600